

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**NOTICE OF PENALTIES INCURRED AND DUE
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LAWS AND RULES**

**PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TH-190073
PENALTY AMOUNT: \$200**

Renzenberger, Inc., d/b/a Hallcon
711 Capitol Way S., Suite 204
Olympia, WA 98501

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes that Renzenberger, Inc., d/b/a Hallcon (Hallcon or Company) violated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-62-278, Contract Crew Transportation Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 395 – Hours of Service of Drivers.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.04.405 allows penalties of \$100 for each violation. In the case of an ongoing violation, every day's continuance is considered a separate and distinct violation.

On October 8, 2018, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Robert Auderer completed a focused safety investigation of Hallcon and documented the following violations:

- **30 violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(a) – Failing to require driver to make a record of duty status.** Hallcon allowed its driver Lue Gene Florence to drive without making a record of duty status on 30 occasions between July 18, 2018, and August 16, 2018.¹
- **17 violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.5(b)(2) – Requiring or permitting a passenger-carrying motor vehicle driver to drive after having been on duty more than 70 hours in eight consecutive days.** Hallcon allowed its driver Lue Gene Florence to drive in violation of the 70 hour rule on 17 occasions between July 25, 2018, and August 16, 2018.²

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalties for these violations:

1. **How serious or harmful the violations are to the public.** The violations noted are very serious and potentially harmful to the public. Companies that fail to accurately record the hours of service of its drivers, and allow its drivers to drive after having been on duty more than 70 hours in eight consecutive days, put the traveling public at significant risk.

¹ The driver, Mr. Florence, failed to record hours on duty working for another employer.

² Mr. Florence exceeded the 70-hour rule by working for another employer.

A fatigued driver presents serious safety concerns.

2. **Whether the violations were intentional.** Considerations include:

- Whether the company ignored Commission staff's previous technical assistance; and
- Whether there is clear evidence through documentation or other means that shows the company knew of and failed to correct the violation.

In July 2018, the Commission received the Company's application for railroad contract crew carrier authority. In the application, Hallcon acknowledged its responsibility to understand and comply with applicable motor carrier safety regulations. The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

3. **Whether the Company self-reported the violations.** The Company did not self-report these violations.
4. **Whether the Company was cooperative and responsive.** Hallcon was responsive and cooperative throughout the investigation.
5. **Whether the Company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts.** The Company corrected these violations by adding a section to its driver employment application regarding additional employment, and by informing all current drivers that additional employment must be reported to Hallcon's management.
6. **The number of violations.** Commission staff identified two violation types with a total of 47 occurrences.
7. **The number of customers affected.** The Company reported 131,055 intrastate miles traveled in 2017. A significant number of customers, as well as members of the traveling public, were potentially affected by these safety violations.
8. **The likelihood of recurrence.** The Commission does not know if Hallcon is likely to repeat these safety violations; however, the Company was cooperative, willingly accepted technical assistance, and took immediate steps to correct the violations.
9. **The Company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** The Company has no history of safety penalties.
10. **The Company's existing compliance program.** Lon Ingram, Corporate Safety Manager of Hallcon, is responsible for the Company's safety compliance program.
11. **The size of the Company.** Hallcon is large company with 200 drivers and 129 motor vehicles. The Company reported \$13,476,624 in gross revenue in 2017.

The Commission's Enforcement Policy provides that some Commission requirements are so fundamental to safe operations that the Commission will issue mandatory penalties for each occurrence of a first-time violation.³ The Commission generally will assess penalties per type of violation, rather than per occurrence, for first-time violations of those critical regulations that do not meet the requirements for mandatory penalties. The Commission will assess penalties for any equipment violation meeting the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's "out-of-service" criteria and also for repeat violations of critical regulations, including each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize Hallcon \$200 for violations of WAC 480-62-278, Contract Crew Transportation Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 395, calculated as follows:

- 30 violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.8(a) – Failing to require drivers to make a record of duty status. These are first-time violations. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 per violation type, for a total of \$100.
- 17 violations of Title 49 CFR Part 395.5(b)(2) – Requiring or permitting a passenger-carrying motor vehicle driver to drive after having been on duty more than 70 hours in eight consecutive days. These are first-time violations. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 per violation type, for a total of \$100.

This information, if proven at a hearing and not rebutted or explained, is sufficient to support the penalty assessment.

Your penalty is due and payable now. If you believe any or all of the violations did not occur, you may deny committing the violation(s) and contest the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. Or, if there is a reason for any or all of the violations that you believe should excuse you from the penalty, you may ask for mitigation (reduction) of the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. The Commission will grant a request for hearing only if material issues of law or fact require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any request to contest the violation(s) or for mitigation of the penalty must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that request. Failure to provide such a statement will result in denial of the request. *See* RCW 81.04.405.

If you properly present your request for a hearing and the Commission grants that request, the Commission will review the evidence supporting your dispute of the violation(s) or application for mitigation in a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding before an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge will consider the evidence and will notify you of his or her decision.

You must act within 15 days after receiving this notice to do one of the following:

- Pay the amount due.
- Contest the occurrence of the violations.

³ Docket A-120061 – Enforcement Policy of the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission – Section V.

- Request mitigation to contest the amount of the penalty.

Please indicate your selection on the enclosed form and submit it electronically through the Commission's web portal **within FIFTEEN (15) days** after you receive this notice. If you are unable to use the web portal, you may submit it via email to records@utc.wa.gov. If you are unable to submit the form electronically, you may send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

If you do not act within 15 days, the Commission may take additional enforcement action, including but not necessarily limited to suspending or revoking your certificate to provide regulated service, assessing additional penalties, or referring this matter to the Office of the Attorney General for collection.

DATED at Olympia, Washington, and effective March 13, 2019.

/s/ Rayne Pearson
RAYNE PEARSON
Director, Administrative Law Division

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
PENALTY ASSESSMENT TH-190073

PLEASE NOTE: You must complete and sign this document, and send it to the Commission within 15 days after you receive the penalty assessment. Use additional paper if needed. I have read and understand RCW 9A.72.020 (printed below), which states that making false statements under oath is a class B felony. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify to the matters set forth below and I have personal knowledge of those matters. I hereby make, under oath, the following statements.

1. **Payment of penalty.** I admit that the violations occurred and enclose \$200 in payment of the penalty.

2. **Contest the violations.** I believe that some or all of the alleged violations did not occur for the reasons I describe below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your contest here, your request will be denied**):

a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision

OR b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

3. **Application for mitigation.** I admit the violations, but I believe that the penalty should be reduced for the reasons set out below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your application here, your request will be denied**):

a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision

OR b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing, including information I have presented on any attachments, is true and correct.

Dated: _____ [month/day/year], at _____ [city, state]

Name of Respondent (Company) – please print

Signature of Applicant

RCW 9A.72.020:

“Perjury in the first degree. (1) A person is guilty of perjury in the first degree if in any official proceeding he makes a materially false statement which he knows to be false under an oath required or authorized by law. (2) Knowledge of the materiality of the statement is not an element of this crime, and the actor’s mistaken belief that his statement was not material is not a defense to a prosecution under this section. (3) Perjury in the first degree is a class